

above the middle, descending very little in front, constricted behind the lip. Surface *very glossy*; the embryonic  $1\frac{1}{2}$  whorls appear smooth except for weak radial wrinkles below the suture, but under the microscope close spiral lines of punctures are seen; following 1 or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  whorls have weak growth wrinkles and an indistinct pattern of low papillae. The remaining whorls have weak, fine growth wrinkles, which become rather close, sharp striae behind the prelabial constriction, the base more glossy with the striation weaker. All post-embryonic whorls have a microscopic sculpture of close spirals, which appear more or less punctate under sufficient magnification. The aperture is rounded-lunate. Peristome faintly flesh tinted, reflected, a little thickened within, with a low, tubercular tooth in the outer part of the basal lip. Parietal callus thin, transparent, bearing a very weak, short, obliquely placed parietal tooth.

Height 5.8 mm., diam. 13 mm. Type. Other topotypes measure from  $6.4 \times 12$  mm. to  $7 \times 14$  mm.

New Mexico: western slope of the Organ Mts. above Dripping Spring (La Cueva), in the N.-E. branch of the canyon, estimated elevation 7000 to 7500 ft. Type 165909 ANSP., coll. by Ferriss and Pilsbry, 1922.

The brilliant gloss of "live" shells is a conspicuous feature. The basal tooth is often reduced to a mere vestige; when strongly developed there is usually also the trace of an inner basal tooth. The parietal tooth is variable, rarely distinct, and entirely wanting in a few shells.

There seems to be no nearly related species. Probably other more fully toothed forms may turn up in the Organ Range, which has been explored for shells only in one place; if so, they may give a clue to the relationships of *A. organensis*.

It occurred in long, narrow slides of small stone on a very steep incline. There is sparse growth of scrub oak, scrub maple, and a few yellow pines, pinyons and cedar. Though this station is not very high, it is one of the steepest climbs anywhere.

---

## THE TYPE OF POLYGYRA SAY

BY HARALD A. REHDER

Pilsbry (Proc. ANSP., vol. 82, 1930, p. 311) credits the type designation for *Polygyra* to Herrmannsen (Ind. Gen. Malac. Prim., vol. 2, 317 (1847)) who gave *Helix septemvolva* Say as

type. Herrmannsen's work appeared in parts at different times, and according to Herrmannsen himself (op. cit., Suppl., p. iv) the signature containing the above type designation appeared on December 7, 1847. The type designation of Gray (Proc. Zool. Soc. London, vol. 15, 1847, p. 173), who gave *Helix auriculata* Say as type, appeared in November, 1847, which has a month's priority. *Polygyra* s.s. will therefore replace *Daedalochila* Beck, and for the group typified by *Polygyra septemvolva* Say we will have to use *Ulostoma* Albers (Die Heliceen, 1850, p. 95), of which *Polygyra septemvolva* was designated as type by Pilsbry in 1930 (op. cit., p. 312).

*Cyclodoma* Swainson (Treat. Malac., 1840, p. 193) is listed as an available name for this group by Pilsbry (loc. cit.), but it is very unsatisfactory. Swainson erected it as a subgenus of *Lucernella*, which was characterized as having a depressed spire, the sides convex and not carinated, and the outer and inner lips with teeth. *Cyclodoma* was further characterized as being depressed, small, and usually striate, and inhabiting the mountains of North America and Madeira. Later (op. cit., p. 329), he united it with *Lucernella*, and on the next page added the subgenus *Polygyra* with *septemvolva* listed under it. This incorporation with *Lucernella*, (typified by *Helix hippocastaneum* Lam.) and the earlier (op. cit., p. 193), mention of its "obvious union" with the toothless *Hemicycla plicaria* Lam. from the Canaries, lead one to suspect that the author may have had before him some of the *Polygyras*, but hardly *septemvolva* which is quite different in shape and apertural characters, and which he considered distinct. But just what species of *Polygyra* he included we can not know, and what similar Madeiran forms he had in mind is hard to say. Altogether it is a highly uncertain group and I suggest that it be considered a *genus dubius*.

---

## NOTES

OSTREA KAMEHAMEHA, new name for *Ostrea bryani* Pils., Proc. A.N.S. Phila. 1917, p. 329; not *O. bryani* Gabb, 1876. The type of this big oyster from Waianae (Oahu), is in the B. P. Bishop Museum at Honolulu. A fine series of topotypes in the museum of the Academy was collected by Mr. Tha anum and myself in